

REMARKS

Claims 1-26 have been examined. Claims 1, 2, 8, 11, 12, 15, 24 and 25 have been amended. Claims 10, 13 and 14 have been canceled. Reconsideration of the claims, as amended, is respectfully requested.

Initial Comments

Counsel wishes to thank the Examiner for the interview of May 9, 2006. A summary of the interview is set forth in an appropriate Interview Summary Form.

Claim Objections

Claims 11 and 13 have been objected to for various formalities. Claim 11 has been amended to clarify that the exterior edges of the internal sheath are flush with the frame. Hence, this objection is overcome. Claims 13 and 14 have been canceled, thereby rendering this rejection moot as to claims 13 and 14.

Drawings

With the amendment of claim 11 and the cancellation of claims 13 and 14, the drawing objection is rendered moot. Hence, no new drawings are being submitted.

Claim Rejections - 35 U.S.C. § 112

Claim 9 has been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, for using the term “fastening mechanisms.” As conjectured by the Examiner, such fastening mechanisms could include screws, nails, adhesive, welding or the like. Hence, this limitation is not indefinite and it is respectfully requested that this rejection be withdrawn.

Claim Rejections - 35 U.S.C. § 102

Claims 1, 8 and 11 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102 as being anticipated by Chen. As set forth in the Interview Summary Form, the amendment of claim 1 to include at least two outer edges of the external sheath which extend beyond the frame overcomes this rejection.

Claim Rejections - 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 2-7, 9, 13, 14 and 24-26 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as being unpatentable over Chen. Claims 2-7 and 9 depend from claim 1 and are distinguishable over Chen for at least the reasons previously described.

Claims 24-26 have been amended to include the limitation that at least two outer edges of the external frame extend beyond the internal frame. Hence, claims 24-26 are distinguishable.

Claims 16-20, 22 and 23 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as being unpatentable over Zen. These claims depend from claim 15 which recites that the internal frame comprise at least one tubular member and that the exterior edges of the exterior sheath extend beyond the internal frame. As indicated in the Interview Summary Form, these claims are distinguishable over the cited art.

Claims 1 and 10 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Zen in view of Lynch. Claims 1 and 10 are distinguishable over Zen which does not describe the amended limitations of claim 1. Hence, claims 1 and 10 are distinguishable.

Claims 1 and 12 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hammar in view of Lynch. As set forth in the Interview Summary Form, the limitations found in claim 1 are distinguishable over these references. Hence, claims 1 and 12 are distinguishable.

Conclusion

In view of the foregoing, Applicant believes all claims now pending in this application are in condition for allowance. The issuance of a formal Notice of Allowance at an early date is respectfully requested.

If the Examiner believes a telephone conference would expedite prosecution of this application, please telephone the undersigned at 303-571-4000.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: May 16, 2006

/Darin J. Gibby/

Darin J. Gibby
Reg. No. 38,464

TOWNSEND and TOWNSEND and CREW LLP
Two Embarcadero Center, Eighth Floor
San Francisco, CA 94111-3834
Tel: 303-571-4000
Fax: 415-576-0300
DJG/jln
60759361 v2